DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 175 258 FL 010 482

AUTHOR Glad, Diana; And Others
TITLE A Comparison of English Language Acquisition Patterns in English Monolingual and Bilingual Children.
INSTITUTION Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.
PUB DATE Apr 79
NOTE 24p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Students; Case (Grammar); Comprehension; Elementary School Students; *English; English (Second Language); Grammar; *Language Development; Language Proficiency; Language Research; *Language Skills; *Language Tests; *Language Universals; Linguistic Performance; Linguistic Theory; Primary Education; Second Language Learning; Spanish Speaking
IDENTIFIERS Possessives; *Tense (Verbs); Voice (Verbs)

ABSTRACT

English monolingual and Spanish/English bilingual children in kindergarten and first grade in 11 states were administered two tests from the EL CIRCO (CIRCUS) battery. The purpose of the study was to determine comparative acquisition of English grammar for kindergarteners and first graders and for bilingual and English monolingual children. Data were sought to support or refute general hypotheses of language acquisition. Data indicate that: (1) comprehension precedes performance in the acquisition of verbal inflections for tense, and tenses are mastered in a specific order; (2) children distinguish between third person possessive adjectives of gender (his and her) before those of number (his and their); and (3) the active voice and the concept of agent are acquired before the passive voice and the concept of object (agent-object relationship in embedded sentences and passive voice were undifferentiated in bilingual children tested). Data do not support a similar order of acquisition of monolingual and bilingual children of direct and indirect object relationships. In the area of subject-verb agreement, comprehension, but not performance, was undifferentiated in both monolingual and bilingual children. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A Comparison of English Language Acquisition Patterns in English Monolingual and Bilingual Children

Diana Glad, Presenter
Marilyn Goodrich and Roy Hardy
Educational Testing Service
April, 1979

ED175258

There are three basic assumptions of language acquisition that I would like to address:

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Diana Glad

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

1. A commonly held assumption about language is that it develops within some kind of constraints on order (Kessler, 1971). It is held that certain syntactic structures require more complex cognitive processes and, therefore, are acquired later than the simpler syntactic structures (Piaget, 1955).

2. It is also a commonly held assumption that comprehension skills precede production skills in the acquisition of linguistic structures.

3. The theory of language universals holds that although languages differ considerably from one another, every language is based on identical principles of semantics, syntax, and phonology -- the deep structures that are common to all languages (Lenneberg, 1967). Given proper exposure, the sequence of learning a second language is the same as that of first language acquisition.

Although the three aforementioned hypotheses are generally recognized, the precise order of language acquisition for the monolingual as well as the bilingual child is still speculative. This study reports an analysis of language acquisition patterns in a sample of English monolingual children as well as children at various stages of bilingualism in English and Spanish. It is hoped that results can be used to test the validity of the aforementioned theories in language development.

FL010182

History

The following paper reports data originally collected during the norming administration (Fall, 1977) of a battery of tests, adapted by Educational

Testing Service from the CIRCUS battery of preschool instruments, entitled EL CIRCO and developed under contract from the Administration of Children, Youth and Families, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The development of the EL CIRCO test battery spanned three years and included the administration of the twelve instruments that comprise the EL CIRCO battery. More than 15,000 4-, 5-, and 6-year old Spanish-speaking children from across the United States participated in the development of EL CIRCO. To these children and to their English monolingual classmates who also agreed to participate in the study, to their parents and their schools, we express our sincere appreciation.

Our study will report analyses of performance on two tests from the EL CIRCO battery. Both instruments are measures of English language abilities. What Words Are For is a measure of receptive language skills which tests the child's ability to comprehend morphological and syntactic markers in English. You Say It is the accompanying measure of productive language skills in English. A complete list of the language constructs measured by the two tests is given in Tables I and II.

Sample and Procedures. The children selected for inclusion in the study were sampled from kindergarten and first grade programs in United States counties or districts wherein five percent or more of the total population was Spanish speaking, according to the 1970 U. S. Census Report. In the fall of 1977, What Words Are For and You Say It - the only English tests in the EL CIRCO battery - were administered to English monolingual and Spanish/English bilingual children in kindergarten and first grade programs located in eleven states. For the monolingual group, the sample size on the receptive test was 162 at the kindergarten level and 181 at the first grade level;

on the productive test, it was 84 at the kindergarten level and 72 at the first grade level. For bilinguals, the sample size on the receptive tests was 1,060 at the kindergarten level and 1291 at the first grade level; on the productive test, it was 722 at the kindergarten level and 943 at the first grade level. More detailed information regarding the sampling procedure is included in the CIRCO Technical Report and Ma. .l (Hardy, Glad, Bernal and Cordova, 1978).

In order to interpret the English comprehension and productive skills of the Spanish-speaking sample, a small number of English monolingual students from kindergarten and first grade was selected from the same schools represented in the EL CIRCO administration. These children were identified by their teachers as being English monolingual and served to establish the ceiling of expected performance of the EL CIRCO norming sample. It was felt that language skills not normally possessed by five- and six-year old native English-speaking children should not be expected of children who are fully bilingual or for whom English is the second language. Tables III and IV provide comparison data for the Spanish speakers and English monolinguals who took What Words Are For and You Say It during the EL CIRCO norming administration.

The tests were administered by bilingual examinees experienced in working with young people and trained by ETS. The receptive language measure was administered to small groups of three or four children. The productive language measure was administered individually. All tests were centrally scored by ETS. Scores of children responding to less than 80 per cent of the items of What Words Are For or You Say It were not included in further analyses. Of the Spanish-speaking sample, 132 (11%) of the kindergarten children tested and 36 (3%) of the first graders failed to meet the criterion on the receptive language measure; 126 (15%) kindergarteners and 76 (7%) first graders failed to respond

to the productive language measure. For the English monolingual sample, only 2 of the 159 kindergarteners and 1 of the 177 first graders failed to meet the criterion on the receptive language measures. No child in the English monolingual comparison group failed to complete the productive language measure.

Design of Investigation. The study focuses on a comparison of the sequential order of language acquisition of English monolingual children and children bilingual in Spanish and English. The study is primarily concerned with the ordering of a sample of inflectional and syntactic constructs in English as they relate to 1) competence, or the internalized set of rules of grammar, and 2) performance or the actual use of the English language. The study tests the theory of language universals which posits that children simultaneously acquiring two languages in a natural language setting will develop either language in the same sequence as that of monolingual children. This sequence is dependent upon the extent of linguisitic complexity with the most linguistically complex structures being acquired last and not fully developed by children 6-8 years of age. (See Kessler, 1971.) The study is primarily concerned with relatively late-developing structures in monolingual children as directly stated or implicitly implied by the literature on child language acquisition. Although the most recent studies in this area have described child language acquisition in terms of transformational or case grammar, in this study we have tried to speak of the grammatical structures in English in terms of traditional grammatical concepts that can be understood by those without formal training in structural linguistics or taxonomic grammar.

This study in no way purports to exhaust the possibilities for comparisons or contrasts between English monolingual and Spanish/English bilingual children. It is hoped, however, that the grammatical structures that have been selected to compare English language development across the two groups of children will

prove helpful to educators in bilingual programs whose students come from homes where Spanish is spoken.

In our analyses, we were concerned with three areas of English language development:

1. the relative sequence of receptive language skills (competence) of monolingual and bilingual children

2. the relative sequence of productive language skills (performance) of monolingual and bilingual children

3. the relative sequence of receptive vs. productive language skills for monolingual and bilingual children

The hypotheses were that within receptive skills the following sequences exist:

1a. For verbal inflections-tense, the present progressive is mastered before the future, which is mastered before the present perfect.

1b. For verbal inflections-subject-verb agreement, mastery of plural agreement is achieved before that of singular agreement.

1c. For possessives, third person gender is mastered before third person number.

1d. Acquisition of active voice occurs before that of passive voice.

1e. The concept of object is acquired in the order of reflexive before direct/indirect before object inversion.

1f. Acquisition of relative clauses is such that subject of clause is mastered before object of clause.

For productive skills two concepts were measured: verbal inflections, and subject-verb agreement. The following sequences were hypothesized:

2a. For verbal inflections-tense, it was hypothesized that present progressive is mastered before present, which is mastered before future, which is mastered before the past tense.

2b. With the concept of subject verb agreement, it was hypothesized that acquisition of plural subject/verb agreement occurs before that of singular subject/verb agreement.

In comparing the relative sequence of receptive and productive skills in English, two hypotheses were tested:

3a. Within each concept, acquisition of receptive skills occurs before that of productive ability.

3b. Monolinguals and bilinguals show no difference in their sequence of acquisition of verbal inflections for tense and subject-verb agreement.

To determine whether sequencing was statistically significant, the data were analyzed in the following way: Each concept was divided into its various categories. For example, tense was divided into the categories present progressive, future, and present perfect. For each subject a category was considered mastered if all items in that category were correct. Mastery was coded as "1" and less-than-mastery coded as "0" for each category. On a given concept each individual then had a pattern of "1's" and "0's." For a concept consisting of 2 categories there were 4 possible patterns of "1's" and "0's," for a 3-category concept 8 possible patterns, for a 4-category concept 16 possible patterns, and for a 5-category concept 32 possible patterns. With a 2-category concept three of the four possible patterns of "1's" and "0's" are compatible with the hypothesis of sequencing. For example, the concept of subject-verb agreement has two categories - plural subject and singular subject. The hypothesized sequence of acquisition is that plural subject is mastered before singular subject. The patterns of "1's" and "0's" compatible with the hypothesis of sequencing would be the codes of 1-1, 1-0, and 0-0 for plural subject and singular subject respectively. The code 0-1 would be incompatible with the hypothesis of sequencing. If an individual has a pattern compatible with the hypothesis of sequencing, he is then coded as 1, and if he does not, he is then coded as zero. This procedure is done on all concepts.

For each concept measured receptively and for each measured productively, the data was divided into four groups: monolingual first grade, monolingual kindergarten, bilingual first grade, and bilingual kindergarten. The data was analyzed by a one-sample chi-square test. The number of observations which did fit the hypothesized patterns of sequencing were compared with the number which did not fit the hypothesized patterns.

For the comparison of the relative sequence of receptive and productive skills there was one further reduction in the data. Since it was hypothesized that receptive skills precede productive skills, the patterns 1-1, 1-0, and 0-0 on receptive and productive concepts, respectively, were considered compatible with the hypothesis of sequencing, and the pattern 0-1 was considered not compatible. The data was then analyzed with a two-sample chi-square test such that monolinguals and bilinguals were compared in terms of being compatible or not compatible with the hypothesis of sequencing on the concepts of verbal inflections-tense and verbal inflection-subject verb agreement.

Results and Discussion

1. Sequence of receptive skills

Table III lists the language constructs measured receptively by What Words Are For and the mastery level of these constructs by English monolingual and Spanish/English bilingual children in kindergarten and first grade.

The specific language constructs are listed in their hypothesized order of acquisition within each concept measured. The hierarchy of difficulty, as evidenced by the mean p+ value of items measuring each construct, suggests that a sequence of acquisition, consistent with the hypothesized order, is present for all but two of the fourteen constructs measured. The two instances where the data do not support the suggested hierarchy of language acquisition are the agreement in number of subject and verb and the relationship of the direct and the indirect object.

Table V reports whether data are compatible with the hypothesized sequence of acquisition within each concept measured. The chi-square analyses show that the area of subject-verb agreement is incompatible with the hypothesized sequence for both language groups and at both grade levels.

Response patterns suggest that, for both the monolingual and the bilingual sample and for both age groups, the construct of verbal inflection denoting number is undifferentiated. Dale (1976) calls particular attention to subject-verb agreement as a difficult area of comprehension for young children. Keeney and Wolfe (1972) have also shown that while young children have mastered subject-verb agreement in their spontaneous speech (a point which shall be discussed later in this paper), they were not able to show mastery of subject-verb agreement in comprehension tasks.

The second instance where data do not support the suggested hierarchy of language acquisition is in the relationship between the direct and the indirect

object of a sentence. Previous studies (Green, 1969; Kessler, 1971) have supported the theory that when present, young children will identify the first case in a sentence as the subject, the second case as the object, and the third case as the indirect object or goal. (e.g., "The boy shows the clown to the teacher."). According to Kessler's findings with children bilingual in Italian and English when the surface structure is inverted ("The boy shows the teacher the clown"), the relationship between direct and indirect was almost completely undifferentiated. Kessler concludes that, for bilingual children 6-8 years of age, the earlier acquired relationship corresponds to the general rule of series for case grammar: agent-verb-object-preposition-goal (indirect object). The later acquired relationship and one that is English specific, is agent-verb-goal (indirect object)-object.

Our findings with children bilingual in English and Spanish support this hierarchical sequence. Table III shows that as a group, the structures that the children handled with the most difficulty was the normally held relationship of direct object followed by preposition followed by indirect object. There was no change in mean item difficulty for the construct direct object followed by indirect object between kindergarten and first grade in the bilingual sample. In the monolingual sample, fewer children responded correctly to such items at first grade than at kindergarten.

Table V reports that the chi-square analyses performed on the direct/indirect object relationships are not compatible (for monolinguals only) with the hypothesized sequence. Analyses performed on the bilingual sample are compatible with the hypothesis. Because the inversion of object pronouns is English specific, the sequence of acquisition for Spanish-speaking children would be later acquired than the structure common to both English and Spanish. It is possible that for English monolinguals, for whom language interference

is not an issue, the inverted order (indirect/ direct object) is acquired first. While results on such few items cannot be considered conclusive, the data suggest that this is an area for further investigation.

2. Sequence of productive skills.

Table IV lists the language constructs measured by the children's actual performance on the productive language test, You Say It. * As can be seen by the mastery levels and the mean p+ values, items measuring verbal inflections for tense posed no real problem for the monolingual group. Mastery or performance is apparent for each of the tense categories measured at the kindergarten level and at first grade. For the bilingual group, an ordering is suggested by the mean difficulty of the items for each verb tense.

Table V reports analyses to be consistent with the hypothesized sequence of verbal tense mastery for both the monolingual and the bilingual children at the kindergarten level, and for the bilinguals only at first grade. Results suggest that once total mastery is achieved, patterns of sequence disappear. For the monolingual first grade sample, more complex verb tenses need to be measured in order for a hierarchy of sequence to be evidenced.

In the area of subject-verb agreement, Table III shows almost identical patterns present in the item difficulty levels between monolingual and bilingual children in either age group. The correct plural agreement of subject and verb was given more than three times as frequently as the singular agreement where the "-s" inflection is required. Table V shows performance to be consistent with the hypothesis for both groups and at both age levels.

* In this task, the child was shown pictures and then asked questions designed to elicit specific inflections. The responses were written down verbatim and then scored on the basis of their appropriateness and grammatical correctness. Only responses in English were scored as correct.

3. Relative sequence of receptive vs. productive skills.

The hypothesis for each concept investigated was that both monolinguals and bilinguals at the kindergarten and first grade levels would have significantly more individual patterns of language acquisition compatible with the hypothesis of sequencing than incompatible with that hypothesis. The following tables present the results of the statistical analyses testing this hypothesis for each concept. Table VI presents the summation of results of the two-sample chi-square tests that were used to test the hypothesis of sequencing within receptive skills and within the productive skills measured.

For the concept verbal inflection of tense, the study provides no evidence that the monolinguals and bilinguals differ in the relative sequence of receptive and productive language skills in English. Both monolinguals and bilinguals were found to demonstrate sequencing in acquisition compatible with the hypothesis that receptive skills precede productive skills in language acquisition.

For the concept of verbal inflections of subject-verb agreement, however, monolinguals and bilinguals were found to differ in their relative acquisition of receptive and productive skills. While at the kindergarten level, data from the bilingual group were compatible with the hypothesis of relative sequence in the predicted direction, data from the monolingual group were not compatible. At the first grade level, however, neither group demonstrated evidence of sequencing compatible with the hypothesis that comprehension precedes performance. On the contrary, both groups had more instances of children who were able to use subject-verb agreement correctly but were not able to show mastery of the concept in the comprehension tasks presented.

Summary of Results

A similar order of acquisition is supported by the data for monolingual and bilingual children in the constructs of verbal inflections for tense adjectival inflections of gender and number, and agent-object relationships of simple and embedded sentences. Data support the hypothesis of a hierarchy of acquisition in the following areas:

1. Verb tense. In comprehension, the present progressive tense precedes the future tense which precedes the present perfect tense. In their performance, monolingual and bilingual children show mastery of tense in the order - present progressive, present, future or near future, past or present perfect. Once mastery is acquired, however, sequencing within the concept of tense is no longer evident in productive skills. Comprehension precedes performance in the acquisition of verbal inflections for tense.

2. Adjectival inflections. Children distinguish between third person possessive adjectives of gender (his and her) before those of number (his and their). The sequence of acquisition appears to be the same for monolingual and bilingual children despite differences between English and Spanish in the surface structure of forming possessives.

3. Agent-object relationships. Data show that understanding of the agent of an action is acquired first and the object of the action later in items measuring voice and relative clauses. The active voice is acquired before the passive, which is acquired late by monolingual children of the age groups sampled and is largely undifferentiated by the bilingual children tested. In relative clauses, comprehension of the agent of the subordinate action is acquired first. The agent-object relationship in embedded sentences is largely undifferentiated by the bilingual children tested.

Data do not support a similar order of acquisition for monolingual and bilingual children in the area of direct and indirect object relationships. For the bilingual children the rank order, common to both Spanish and English, agent-verb-direct object-preposition-indirect object is acquired first. For the monolingual chilldren, our data show that the inverted rank order of agent- verb-indirect object-direct object is acquired first. Our findings, for the monolingual children sampled, are contrary to the hypothesized order of acquisition.

A second area where our data do not support hypotheses of language acquisition is in the area of subject-verb agreement. In comprehension tasks, agreement in number of subject and verb is undifferentiated by both monolingual and bilingual children of the age groups sampled although performance shows the ability to use rules of agreement while speaking.

It is our hope that these findings can contribute to a greater understanding of language development in the child, especially in the area of second language development. We hope that implications by language teachers can also be drawn for an appropriate sequencing of instructional materials in bilingual classrooms.

TABLE I

Grammatical Structures in English Selected from the
EL CIRCO Test of Receptive Language,
What Words Are For *

CONSTRUCT	EXAMPLE
Verbal Inflections	
1. Tense	
Present progressive	Mark the bird that is flying.
Future	Mark the clown who will buy ice cream.
Present perfect	Mark the girl who has kicked the ball.
2. Person on subject-verb agreement	
Plural verb	The deer jump.
Singular verb	The fish swims.
Adjectival Inflections	
1. Gender (his vs. her)	The dancer walks on her hands.
2. Number (his vs. their)	The man stands on their shoulders.
Voice	
1. Active	The clown watches the elephant.
2. Passive	The horse is chased by the giraffe.
Object Relationships	
1. Reflexive	The clown hits himself.
2. Direct/indirect	The teacher shows the juggler to the girls.
3. Indirect/direct	The boy shows the teacher the clown.
Relative Clauses	
1. Subject of clause	Mark the clown that is pulling the donkey
2. Object of clause	Mark the boy that the girl is chasing

* All structures are listed in the hypothesized sequence of acquisition within each construct based on relative linguistic complexity.

TABLE II

Grammatical Structures in English Selected from the
EL CIRCO Test of Productive Language,
You Say It *

CONSTRUCT	EXAMPLES OF CORRECT RESPONSES
Verbal Inflections	
1. Tense	
Present progressive	(Tell me what this monkey is doing.)
	Climbing. He's climbing. Holding on.
Present	(Tell me what cooks do.)
	They cook. Make cookies.
Future or near future	(What do you think she will do with the scissors?)
	She'll cut. She is going to cut.
Past or present perfect	(What has this man done?)
	He has painted the wagon. He painted it.
2. Person or subject-verb agreement	
Plural verb	(What do these dogs do?)
	They run. They're running.
Singular verb	(What does this monkey do?)
	It climbs. It's climbing.

* All items, except those measuring the present tense, are accompanied by pictures.

TABLE III

Performance of English Monolingual and Spanish/English Bilingual Children on Receptive Language Concepts Measured by What Words Are For

(Test 8E)

Concept	Item Number(s)	Mastery[1] K Mono	Mastery[1] K Bi	Mastery[1] 1st gr. Mono	Mastery[1] 1st gr. Bi	P-Value[2] K Mono	P-Value[2] K Bi	P-Value[2] 1st gr. Mono	P-Value[2] 1st gr. Bi
Verbal Inflections - Tense									
Present progressive	1, 4	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	.97	.86	.99	.93
Future	6, 7, 8	Yes	Part	Yes	Yes	.85	.64	.93	.81
Present perfect	2, 3, 5	Yes	Part	Yes	Yes	.80	.64	.85	.77
Verbal Inflections - Subject-verb agreement									
Plural subject	30	No	No	No	No	.27	.26	.27	.17
Singular subject	29	Part	Part	Yes	Part	.61	.62	.76	.70
Possessives									
3rd person singular	35, 36, 37	Yes	Part	Yes	Yes	.89	.73	.93	.79
3rd person plural	38, 39	Part	Part	Yes	Part	.75	.64	.89	.74
Voice									
Active	22	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	.97	.83	.97	.92
Passive	23, 24, 25	Part	No	Yes	No	.68	.46	.77	.51

TABLE III (continued)

(Test 8E)

Concept	Item Number(s)	Mastery[1] K Mono	K Bi	1st gr. Mono	1st gr. Bi	P-Value[2] K Mono	K Bi	1st gr. Mono	1st gr. Bi
Object									
Reflexive	26, 27, 28	Yes	Part	Yes	Yes	.87	.74	.93	.87
Direct/indirect	31, 32	Part	No	No	No	68	.57	.59	.57
Object inversion	33, 34	Part	No	Yes	Part	.67	.59	.84	.69
Relative Clauses									
Subject of Clause	19	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	.95	.81	.96	.89
Object of Clause	20, 21	Part	No	Part	No	.63	.50	.67	.54

[1] A receptive concept is considered mastered if 76% of the children answered the item correctly; partially mastered if 50-75% of the children answered correctly; and not mastered if less than 50% of the children answered correctly on items having 3 response choices (present progressive and present perfect. For all other receptive items there are only two response choices, and for those items a higher criterion of 60% correct was required for partial mastery. For concepts measured more than one item, the mean p-value was used to determine mastery.

[2] The p-value is the proportion of children answering a given item correctly. For concepts measured by more than one item, the mean p-value is reported.

TABLE IV

Performance of English Monolingual and Spanish/English Bilingual Children on English Productive Language Concepts Measured by You Say It

(Test 10E, Part I)

Concept	Item Number(s)	Mastery[1]				P-Value[2]			
		K		1st gr.		K		1st gr.	
		Mono	Bi	Mono	Bi	Mono	Bi	Mono	Bi
Verbal Inflections - Tense									
Present progressive	4, 5, 6	Yes	Part	Yes	Yes	.93	.56	.90	.78
Present	1, 2, 3	Yes	Part	Yes	Part	.82	.53	.80	.69
Future	7, 8, 9	Yes	Part	Yes	Yes	.71	.56	.75	.71
Present perfect	12, 13	Yes	No	Yes	Part	.71	.41	.79	.52
Past	10, 11, 12, 13	Yes	No	Yes	Part	.70	.41	.77	.53
Subject-Verb Agreement									
Plural subject	15	Part	Part	Yes	Yes	.57	.57	.72	.72
Singular subject	14, 16	No	No	No	No	.20	.16	.20	.19

[1] A productive concept is considered mastered if 70% of the children answered the item correctly; partially mastered if 50-69% of the children answered correctly; and not mastered if less than 50% of the children answered correctly.

[2] The p-value is the proportion of children answering a given item correctly. For concepts measured by more than one item, the mean p-value is reported.

TABLE V

Summary of Chi-Square Analyses for Receptive and Productive Concepts

Concept	Compatible with Predicted Sequencing [1]			
	K		1st grade	
	Mono	Bi	Mono	Bi
Receptive Skills				
Verbal Inflections-Tense (Present progressive/future/ present perfect)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Verbal Inflections-Subject-Verb-Agreement (plural/singular)	No	No	No	No [2]
Possessives (gender/number)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Voice (active/passive)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Object (reflexive /direct-indirect/ indirect-direct)	No	Yes	No	Yes
Relative Clauses (subject/object of clause)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Productive Skills				
Verbal Inflections-Tense (present progressive/ present/future/past or present perfect)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Verbal Inflections-Subject Verb Agreement (plural/singular)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

[1] $P. \leq .01$

[2] Significant for bilingual first graders but in direction opposite than that predicted for sequencing.

TABLE VI

Relative Sequence of Receptive and Productive Skills in Monolinguals and Bilinguals

a. Tense

Kindergarten — Compatible with Hypothesis

Language group	Yes	No
Monolingual	46	7
Bilingual	160	14

Chi-Square = 1.2892 Prob. = 0.2565

First Grade — Compatible with Hypothesis

Language Group	Yes	No
Monolingual	42	1
Bilingual	209	17

Chi-Square = 1.5625 Prob. = 0.2115

b. Subject - Verb Agreement

Kindergarten — Compatible with Hypothesis

Language Group	Yes	No
Monolingual	23	30
Bilingual	113	61

Chi-Square = 7.8526 Prob. = .0051

First Grade — Compatible with Hypothesis

Language Group	Yes	No
Monolingual	18	22
Bilingual	66	92

Chi-Square = 0.1362 Prob. = 0.7125

References

Dale, P. S. Language Development: Structure and Function (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1976.

Green, E. On Children's Comprehension of Synonym Sentences. TESOL Quarterly, 1969, 3, 189-195.

Hardy, R., Glad, D., Bernal, E., and Cordova, F. CIRCO Technical Report and Manual. Princeton, N J.: Educational Testing Service, 1978.

Keeney, T. J., and Wolfe, J. The Acquisition of Agreement in English. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 1973, 2, 698-705.

Kessler, C. The Acquisition of Syntax in Bilingual Children. Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press, 1971.

Lenneerg, E. H., and Lenneberg E. Foundations of Language Development: A Multidisciplinary Approach (Vol. I). New York: Academic Press, 1975.

Piaget, J. The Language and Thought of the Child. New York: Meridian Books, 1955.